Summary Report

Maple Ash Historic District Neighborhood Meeting August 16, 2006 Tempe Woman's Club 1290 S. Mill Ave. This report is provided by the applicant in fulfillment of ordinance requirements. All information herein including attendance, opinions expressed, tabulations, etc., is as noted by the applicant and has not been substantiated by the City of Tempe.

As required by the City of Tempe Zoning Ordinance, the applicants of the Maple Ash Historic District nomination hosted a Neighborhood Meeting. The purpose of the meeting was to impart information, answer questions and take feedback about district designation. A third-party neutral, Mike Pyatok, architect, facilitated a panel composed of pertinent representatives:

Jenny Lucier, Applicant, Property Owner, Resident, Maple Ash Neighborhood Bob Gasser, Chair, Tempe Historic Preservation Commission Mark Vinson, City of Tempe Architect, Community Development

Jenny Lucier gave a Power Point presentation that addressed frequently asked questions about historic preservation in general and historic preservation specifically in Tempe. Mike Pyatok then opened the floor to questions and comments.

In addition to the panel, 69 individuals attended the meeting. 20 people spoke during the question and comment period. Many of those who attended but did not speak communicated their positions, questions and concerns via follow-up email and personal conversations.

Summary of questions:

What is the owner occupancy rate in the neighborhood?

How does designation affect normal maintenance?

What is the process for review of renovation, remodels or new development once district is in place?

Which properties will be 'affected' by the designation?

Which properties are contributing and which are noncontributing?

What is the difference in the remodeling process for contributing vs. non-contributing?

Will I be able to put an addition on my house?

Will I be able to build a back cottage?

Summary of opposition:

Development or remodeling within a district will require too much extra regulation.

Being a district will reduce property values in the neighborhood.

Property rights are taken away by this designation.

The notification process for nomination was deficient

The district will down zone my property.

Renters, not people who own property in the neighborhood, dominate support for the district.

The buildings and the neighborhood are not historic; they are just old.

Many homes in the neighborhood are too deteriorated to renovate or be of any value.

Other districts around the country don't have multifamily zoning.

The value in this neighborhood is only in the land.

Properties within 300' of the district will be subject to the same restrictions as those in the district.

District designation will inconvenience development plans at ASU.

Summary of support:

Given it is the oldest extant neighborhood remaining in Tempe, Maple Ash should be preserved Preserving the neighborhood is a demonstration of valuing Tempe's heritage.

Older buildings and places such as Maple Ash connect us with our past.

Knowing our past helps us know who we are today.

The character of the neighborhood is so unique it should be saved.

Unique lifestyle in the neighborhood is not available elsewhere.

Opposition to preservation and district designation is driven by greed.

Opposition to being a district is primarily composed of people who don't live in the neighborhood.

It's not just neighbors who think the neighborhood is historically significant; professionals have determined that it is.

Having a single-family neighborhood with unique architecture and lush green lots is going to become more important and valuable as downtown develops. It is an essential complement to the intense land use of downtown.

You can't rebuild the past. Once it is gone, it cannot be duplicated.

The character of Maple Ash is the type of neighborhood new developments are trying to capture.

The question of district designation is not one of just how it will affect the dollar value of a property; it is also about preserving an important community asset.

This neighborhood is important to people all over the city.

Below is enumeration of positions held by those who attended the meeting. It is calculated to demonstrate factors articulated as important to stakeholders: property ownership and residency in the proposed boundary. It is based on information gathered from the sign-in sheet, comments made at the meeting and follow-up emails and conversations.

	Supports Opposes					Row
	District	District	Undecided	Unknown	Neutral	Totals
Total	31	18	3	12	5	69
Percentage of Total	45%	26%	4.3%	17.4%	7.2%	100%
Owner occupant	19	3	2	0	0	24
Absentee owner	4	11	1	3	0	19
Renter in the hood	2	0	0	1	0	3
Outside or neutral party	6	3	0	2	5	16
Unknown	0	1	0	6	0	7

- 74% of those supporting the district own property in the neighborhood.
- Only 3 of the 18 people opposing the district actually live in the neighborhood.
- Of the 14 people that oppose the district and own property here, 78.5% don't live here.
- Only 3 of the people attending the meeting are renters in the neighborhood.
- 44% of the people opposing the district had interest only in College View. Many stated they do not oppose the rest of the district.

Note

The individuals who attended the meeting may or may not be a representative sample of the neighborhood or larger community.

Figures listed in this report are based on individuals attending the meeting, not the number of parcels or square footage of property owned.



